

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**

Appl. No. 09/745,385

Reply to Final OA of February 10, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-37 were originally pending. Claims 35-37 are withdrawn and canceled as belonging to non-elected subject matter. Claims 1-8, 10, 12, 16-18, 20-21, 24-26, and 31 are amended. Claims 38-46 are added. Accordingly, claims 1-34 and 38-46 are currently pending. The claim amendments were made to more particularly point out the subject matter of the invention and not to overcome any teachings or suggestions of the prior art.

In view of the following remarks/arguments, withdrawal of the rejections to the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1-34 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,289,466 to Bayramoglu et al ("*Bayramoglu*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,211,870 to Foster ("*Foster*"). These rejections are traversed.

As a preliminary matter, a previous Response filed on 10/30/03 discussed *Bayramoglu* in view of *Foster* at length, and demonstrated the allowability of the pending claims over this combination. Those arguments are not repeated herein, but are incorporated by reference. The Office is urged to reconsider those arguments in light of the understanding gained from the following arguments.

Independent Claim 1 recites "receiving, by a USB device, a host-specific device request from an application executing on a computing device coupled to the USB device", "identifying, by the USB device, a host-defined string descriptor defined by the application, the host-defined string descriptor being stored in firmware of the USB device", and "communicating, by the USB device, the host-

Appl. No. 09/745,385

Reply to Final OA of February 10, 2004

1 defined string descriptor to the requesting application." Nowhere do the
2 references of record, singly or in combination, teach or suggest these features.

3 The Action at page 3 admits that *Bayramoglu* does not teach or suggest "a
4 host specific device request", as claim 1 recites. Applicant agrees, especially since
5 traditional USB devices are not configured to receive or respond to a request
6 defined by a host of the USB device. At page 5, lines 13, the specification
7 describes that "host-specific USB device requests are not provided or considered
8 by the USB specification, there are no standards that allow a vendor to provide
9 additional USB device-specific information in a USB device in a format that is
10 determined by an operating system."

11 Instead, the ACTION relies on Figs. 9 and 10, col. 7, lines 40 -60 of *Foster*
12 for this missing feature, concluding that it would have been obvious to a person of
13 ordinary skill in the art to combine the references to arrive at the claimed subject
14 matter. This conclusion is unsupportable.

15 The figures 9 and 10 referred to by the Action are described by *Foster*
16 respectively as "a screen shot of a screen object layout screen" and a "screen shot
17 of a custom screen object creation screen". (See, col. 3, line 64 through col. 4, line
18 3). These figures clearly do not teach or suggest the claimed "host specific device
19 request", as claim 1 recites". Referring to Applicant's specification at page 15,
20 lines 4-8, the specification indicates that this novel "host-specific device request is
21 used to request one of a plurality of available host-defined string descriptors from
22 the device. The *wIndex* field of the host-specific device request indicates which of
23 the plurality of strings are to be returned. The device returns the descriptor
24 referred to by *wIndex*." As indicated at page 16, lines 9-10, *wIndex* is used to
25 identify a particular extended property descriptor", shown in Fig. 1 as element

Appl. No. 09/745,385

Reply to Final OA of February 10, 2004

1 122, and which as described above, is a "host-defined string descriptor". Page 9,
2 lines 2-3, describe that "an extended property descriptor 122 is not defined in the
3 USB specification." Nowhere do the figures 9 and 10 of *Foster* teach or suggest
4 such a "host specific device request", as claim 1 recites.

5 Now, let's take a closer look at the portion of *Foster* cited by the Action as
6 "receiving a host specific device request". Col. 7, lines 40-60 state:

7 "The remote control development software preferably stores screen objects
8 in a database. The remote control development software preferably is
9 provided with a number of preconfigured screen objects, and during
10 installation of the remote control development software, a database of the
11 preconfigured screen objects is preferably created. Preconfigured screen
12 objects provide a short cut to programming the programmable remote
13 control unit 200, and may be used as templates in the development phase,
14 discussed below. The preconfigured screen objects can come from an image
15 table or dynamically created by software based upon functionality of the
16 remote and its purpose. The database preferably can differentiate
17 preconfigured screen objects from custom screen objects, and deter the user
18 from editing them.

19 The publisher of the remote control development software preferably makes
20 available new preconfigured screen objects as new multimedia processing
21 units are put on the market to further increase the ease-of- programming of
22 the programmable remote control unit of the invention. The preconfigured
23 screen objects may also be obtained in the aftermarket from third parties,
24 such as the vendors of multimedia processing units.

25 In the learning phase, the commands for the multimedia processing unit 300
are obtained by the remote control development software and used to
prepare a screen object corresponding to the programmed remote control
unit 200 A of the multimedia processing unit 300."

Notice that this teaching of *Foster's* concerning remote control
development software and screen objects is completely silent and does not suggest
"receiving, by a USB device, a host-specific device request from an application
executing on a computing device coupled to the USB device", as claim 1 recites.

Appl. No. 09/745,385

Reply to Final OA of February 10, 2004

1 Thus, the method of Claim 1 is clearly patentable over *Bayramoglu* and/or
2 *Foster*, as are Claims 2-5 and 38-44, which depend therefrom and recite further
3 limitations. For at least these reasons, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of Claims 1
4 and 2-5 are improper and should be withdrawn.

5 Moreover, claims 2-5 include additional features that are not taught or
6 suggested by the cited combination. For instance, claim 2 recites "wherein the
7 host-defined string descriptor comprises user interface information comprises: a
8 custom property section comprised of one or more custom property entries, each
9 custom property entry comprising information that corresponds to a respective
10 custom property for the USB device." Nowhere do the references of record singly
11 or in combination teach or suggest these features.

12 In addressing claim 2, the ACTION points to Fig. 6 of *Bayramoglu* to
13 conclude that to the features of claim 2 are obvious in view of the cited
14 combination. This conclusion is unsupportable. Figure 6 of *Bayramoglu* is "a
15 screen shot of an on-screen display applet". (See, col. 4, lines 23-24). This screen
16 shot of an applet does not teach or suggest the claimed "host-defined string
17 descriptor comprises user interface information comprises: a custom property
18 section comprised of one or more custom property entries, each custom property
19 entry comprising information that corresponds to a respective custom property for
20 the USB device." as Claim 1 recites". Instead, figure 6 shows user interface
21 controls to modify screen attributes such as monitor screen size, position, and
22 geometry attributes. Applicant's specification at page 15, line 23 through page 17,
23 line 2 clearly describes one implementation of the claimed feature of "a custom
24 property section comprised of one or more custom property entries" as shown
25 below:

Appl. No. 09/745,385

Reply to Final OA of February 10, 2004

1 "The custom property section includes information corresponding to
2 one or more control properties 406. Each instance of a control
3 property 406 encapsulates information corresponding to a single
4 custom property for the peripheral device 114 of Fig. 1.

5 Header section 400 stores information about the remaining portions
6 of the extended property descriptor 122. Header section 400
7 includes the following fields:

- 8 • *dwLength*—the total length of the extended property
9 descriptor;
- 10 • *bcdVersion*—the version number of the extended property
11 descriptor;
- 12 • *wIndex*—is used to identify this particular extended property
13 descriptor.
- 14 • *wCount*—the total number of control property entries 406 in
15 the custom property section 402.
- 16 •

17 Using this information, an operating system or computer program
18 application can parse the following custom property section 402.

19 Custom property section 402 is of variable size because it includes
20 one or more custom property entries 406. Each control property
21 section includes information that corresponds to a single custom
22 property for the peripheral device 114 of Fig. 1. The custom
23 property section includes the following fields:

- 24 • *dwSize*—the total length of this particular custom property
25 entry. (in one implementation, this includes header fields as well as
name and property data.)
- *dwPropertyDataType*—the data type of the data that is stored
in the property data buffer (indicated below by *bPropertyData* field);
- *wPropertyNameLength*—the size of the property name;
- *bPropertyName*—the name of the property;
- *dwPropertyDataLength*—the total size of the property data;
- *bPropertyData*—the property data.

Clearly, the user interface controls of figure 6 used to modify screen attributes
such as monitor screen size, position, and geometry attributes do not teach or

Appl. No. 09/745,385

Reply to Final OA of February 10, 2004

1 suggest the claimed "custom property section comprised of one or more custom
2 property entries".

3 For this additional reason, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 2 is
4 improper and should be withdrawn.

5 Claim 3 recites "wherein the user interface information comprises: a
6 custom property section comprising one or more custom property entries, each
7 custom property entry corresponding to a respective custom property for the USB
8 device", and "a header section comprising an indication of the number of custom
9 property entries for which mappings exist in the custom property section."
10 Nowhere do the references of record teach or suggest these claims features.

11 In addressing claim 3, the ACTION points to Fig. 6 of *Bayramoglu* as
12 applied to claim 2, and further points to col. 8, lines 30-40 of *Foster* to conclude
13 that to the features of claim 3 are obvious in view of the cited combination. This
14 conclusion is unsupportable. For the reasons already discussed, figure 6 of
15 *Bayramoglu* does not teach or suggest these claimed features. Here is the cited
16 paragraph from *Foster*:

17 "Accordingly, the remote control development software displays a
18 list of preconfigured screen objects, sorted or limited according to
19 characteristics such as multimedia processing unit type,
20 manufacturer, and date of manufacture. The user may then select
21 one of the preconfigured screen objects, and learning of the
22 commands of the multimedia processing unit 300 is complete (step
23 1280)."

24 Clearly, these preconfigured screen objects are completely silent on "a custom
25 property section comprising one or more custom property entries, each custom
property entry corresponding to a respective custom property for the USB device",
and "a header section comprising an indication of the number of custom property

Appl. No. 09/745,385

Reply to Final OA of February 10, 2004

1 entries for which mappings exist in the custom property section", as Claim 3
2 recites.

3 Thus, the features of Claim 3 are patentable over *Bayramoglu* and/or *Foster*
4 For these addition reasons, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 3 is improper
5 and should be withdrawn.

6 Claim 4 recites "wherein the host-defined string descriptor comprises user
7 interface information comprising an icon, a font, a picture, a label, a help page, or
8 a URL." In addressing this claim, the ACTION refers the already cited portions of
9 *Bayramoglu* and also points to *Foster*, col. 10, lines 50-65. For the reasons already
10 discussed, *Bayramoglu* does not teach or suggest the claimed "host-defined string
11 descriptor". With respect to *Foster*, here is the portion of *Foster* that is cited by
12 the Action:

13 "The remote control development software preferably provides drag
14 and drop tools for the user to create and edit the screen object, and
15 displays a tool box 1050 having a number of object creating and
16 editing tools for the user to use. For example, the user could create a
17 new soft key object by dragging a button tool 1052 to the display
18 area 721 of the representation 726 of the programmable remote
19 control unit 200. A mouse cursor 1260 is shown in FIG. 12 dragging
20 a graphic of a button 1265 for the soft key object. The remote
21 control development software preferably provides other object-
22 oriented editing controls as known in the art. These controls permit
23 the user to modify the shape and location of soft keys, edit the
24 commands associated with soft keys and programmable keys,
25 change text labels, and otherwise edit the appearance of the screen
object."

Nowhere does this teaching of *Foster* of remote control development software,
which is on a computer that is not even on a USB device, teach or suggest the
claimed "host-defined string descriptor, the host-defined string descriptor being

Appl. No. 09/745,385

Reply to Final OA of February 10, 2004

1 stored in firmware of the USB device". Thus, the *Bayramoglu* and/or *Foster* does
2 not teach or suggest any characteristic of a "host-defined string descriptor" such as
3 "comprises user interface information comprising an icon, a font, a picture, a label,
4 a help page, or a URL", as Claim 4 recites.

5 For these additional reasons, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 4 is
6 improper and should be withdrawn.

7 Claim 5 recites, "wherein the application is an operating system." In
8 addressing claim 5, the ACTION points to the already cited portions of
9 *Bayramoglu* and also points to *Foster* col. 4, lines 54-59 to conclude that these
10 features are obvious in view of the cited combination. This conclusion is
11 unsupportable because this portion of *Foster* merely recites "[t]he general purpose
12 computer 100 includes a processor 155 which preferably from Intel Corp. (San
13 Jose, CA) and runs may Microsoft Corp. (Redmond, Washington) Windows
14 operating system. In conjunction with the processor 155, the general-purpose
15 computer 100 has a short-term memory 150 (preferably RAM) and a long-term
16 memory 180 (preferably a hard disk) is known in the art." This does not teach or
17 suggest "receiving, by a USB device, a host-specific device request from an
18 application executing on a computing device coupled to the USB device"
19 (Claim 1), and "wherein the application is an operating system", as recited by
20 Claim 5.

21 Thus, the cited combination of *Bayramoglu* and/or *Foster* does not teach or
22 suggest the features of claim 5. For this addition reason, the 35 USC §103(a)
23 rejection of claim 5 is improper and should be withdrawn.

24 Independent Claim 6 recites "querying, by a computing device coupled to a
25 USB device, the USB device with a host-specific device request for a host-defined

Appl. No. 09/745,385

Reply to Final OA of February 10, 2004

1 string descriptor associated with user interface information stored in firmware of
2 the USB device", and "responsive to the querying, receiving by the computing
3 device, at least a portion of the user interface information." The exemplary
4 arguments stated above with regard to Claim 1 are also applicable to Claim 6. For
5 at least those reasons, a system of *Bayramoglu* that teaches exchange of
6 commands based on a conventional USB specification and/or *Foster* that teaches
7 creating screen objects for transfer to a remote hand-held device that is not
8 described as even being a "USB device" may never utilize "an extended property
9 descriptor", which is not specified in a conventional USB specification, and which
10 claim 6 recites.

11 Thus, the method in Claim 6 is clearly patentable over *Bayramoglu* and/or
12 *Foster*, as are Claims 7-11 and 44, which depend therefrom and recite further
13 limitations. The 35 USC §103(a) rejections of independent Claim 6 and
14 dependent Claims 7-11 are improper and should be withdrawn.

15 Independent Claim 12 recites "[i]n a USB device that responds to device
16 requests from a host, the device requests including USB-specific device requests
17 with corresponding USB-specified request codes and device-specific device
18 requests with corresponding device-specified request codes, the USB-specific
19 device requests including a GET_DESCRIPTOR device request with a
20 corresponding GET_DESCRIPTOR request code", "receiving a
21 GET_DESCRIPTOR device request that specifies a predetermined index, the
22 GET_DESCRIPTOR device request having been received from an application
23 executing on a remote computing device", and "responding to the
24 GET_DESCRIPTOR device request by returning a device-specific request code
25 for subsequent use by the USB device to send an extended property descriptor

Appl. No. 09/745,385

Reply to Final OA of February 10, 2004

1 responsive to subsequent receipt of a host-specific device request from the remote
2 computing device, the extended property descriptor specifying user interface
3 information corresponding to the USB device and provided by a vendor as being
4 in a data format compatible with the application."

5 In addressing Claim 12, the ACTION refers the already cited portions of
6 *Bayramoglu* and *Foster*, and further points to *Bayramoglu*, col. 11, lines 37-65,
7 and col. 12 lines 44-65, to conclude that these features are obvious in view of the
8 cited combination. For the reasons already discussed, *Bayramoglu* does not teach
9 or suggest the claimed "host-defined string descriptor". As such, *Bayramoglu*
10 and/or *Foster* cannot teach or suggest these following features also recited by
11 Claim 12: "responding to the GET_DESCRIPTOR device request by returning a
12 device-specific request code for subsequent use by the USB device to send an
13 extended property descriptor responsive to subsequent receipt of a host-specific
14 device request from the remote computing device".

15 Here is what is further cited by the Action with respect to *Bayramoglu* at
16 col. 11, lines 37-65:

17 "The CPQ_MON.SYS 406 is a ring 0 USB device driver having a
18 ring 3 interface. The MONITOR.DLL 402 uses a Windows
19 DeviceIoControl function to communicate with the CPQ_MON.SYS
20 driver 406 at ring 0. There are a number of other ring 0 modules,
21 including: a bezel board driver (CPQ_BZL.SYS) 408, a legacy bezel
22 board driver (BEZEL.VXD) 410, and an audio driver
23 (CPQ_AUD.SYS) 412. These ring 0 modules further communicate
24 with a single USB device driver (CPQ_USB.SYS) 414. Because all
25 the functions available through the monitor bezel 206 are treated by
the USB 126 as a single USB device, a single device driver
(CPQ_USB.SYS) is utilized. When the USB 126 identifies the
monitor 102 connected, the CPQ_USB.SYS 414 is loaded. In turn,
CPQ_USB.SYS 414 will load CPQ_MON.SYS 406, CPQ_BZL.SYS
408, and CPQ_AUD.SYS 412, the monitor, bezel board, and audio
drivers respectively. This architecture allows these three drivers to

Appl. No. 09/745,385

Reply to Final OA of February 10, 2004

1 sit parallel to each other rather than stacked on top of each other if
2 each was treated as a separate USB function.

3 The CPQ_USB.SYS driver 414 simply operates to pass USB
4 commands from the higher level drivers to a USB hub driver
5 (USBHUB.SYS) 416. The higher level drivers (CPQ_MON.SYS 406 ,
6 CPQ_BZL.SYS 408, and CPQ_AUD.SYS 412) use Windows
7 ReadFile and WriteFile functions to communicate with the
8 USBHUB.SYS 416 (LSB driver stack). The USBHUB.SYS driver 416
9 is a standard hub controller driver (preferably provided by
10 Microsoft)".

11 And Bayramoglu at col. 12 lines 44-65:

12 "The BEZEL.DLL 404 supports a number of multimedia
13 applications 422, such as a CD-ROM player, MIDI player and other
14 applications requiring the bezel buttons 208. When one of the
15 applications is loaded, the application 422 loads the BEZEL.DLL
16 404 and dynamically grabs function pointers to obtain Windows
17 handles and register the bezel buttons with the application 422 . This
18 way, when bezel button events are passed to BEZEL.DLL 404 from
19 USB 126 , BEZEL.DLL 404 can look up the application 422
20 registered to the bezel button 208 and distribute the event to the
21 appropriate application 422. In turn, the BEZEL.DLL 404 loads the
22 BEZEL.VXD and registers with the BEZEL.VXD to obtain a
23 Windows handle. The BEZEL.DLL 404 communicates with the
24 BEZEL.VXD 410 with Windows DeviceIoControl functions. The
25 BEZEL.VXD 410 communicates to the BEZEL.DLL 404 by posting
Windows messages.

When BEZEL.VXD 410 is loaded, it looks for CPQ_BZL.SYS 408
and CPQ_AUD.SYS 412. It performs a WriteFile to each WDM
driver 408 and 412 to register with it and obtain a function pointer.
In turn, CPQ_BZL.SYS 408 and CPQ_AUD.SYS maintain the
pointer for reciprocal communication."

As you can see, these cited sections of Bayramoglu do not cure the already
discussed deficiencies of the cited combination. More particularly, Bayramoglu at
col. 11, lines 37-65, and col. 12 lines 44-65, describes architectural, execution

Appl. No. 09/745,385

Reply to Final OA of February 10, 2004

1 priority, and communication aspects of the system. Although program module and
2 conventional USB device driver communication is taught, nowhere does this
3 portion or any other portion of *Bayramoglu* teach or suggest use of a "host-
4 specific device request for a device-specific request code", as used by Claim 12.
5 Instead, *Bayramoglu* describes at col. 12, lines 15-22 that a conventional "Open
6 Host Controller Interface Specification for USB driver" is utilized. The subject
7 specification, at page 9, lines 2-3, clearly states that "an extended property
8 descriptor" as Applicant claims "is not defined in the USB specification"
9 (emphasis added). Thus, a system of *Bayramoglu* may never utilize such "a host-
10 specific device request" as claim 12 recites. This is especially the case since the
11 "extended property descriptor" is not defined in the USB specification. For at
12 least these additional reasons, Claim 12 is patentable over *Bayramoglu* and/or
13 Foster, as are Claims 13-15, and 45 which depend therefrom and recite further
14 limitations..

15 Thus, the 35 USC §103(a) rejections of Claim 12 and dependent claims 13-
16 15 are improper and should be withdrawn.

17 Moreover, as set forth above with respect to claims 2-5, claims 13-15
18 include additional features that are not taught or suggested by the cited
19 combination. For these additional reasons, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of
20 claims 13-15 should be withdrawn.

21 Independent Claim 16 recites "communicating, by a component of an
22 operating system, a non-standard USB device request to a device, the non-standard
23 USB device request requesting an extended property from the device, the extended
24 property providing data that is predetermined to be compatible for use by the
25 component or the operating system, the data comprising user interface information

Appl. No. 09/745,385

Reply to Final OA of February 10, 2004

1 associated with the USB device", and "responsive to the communicating,
2 receiving, by the component, an extended property descriptor from the device, the
3 extended property descriptor comprising at least the extended property."

4 In addressing claim 16, the ACTION refers the already cited portions of
5 *Bayramoglu* and *Foster*, and then concedes that *Bayramoglu* does not teach or
6 suggest "communicating a non-standard USB device request to a device", and
7 "responsive to the communicating, receiving an extended property descriptor from
8 the device, the extended property descriptor specifying user interface information
9 corresponding to the USB device." Applicant agrees with the Action's concession
10 for the reasons already discussed. However, the ACTION continues to conclude
11 that "the obviousness for receiving extended properties (and their corresponding
12 descriptors) to include user interface specific information is shown in paragraph 4
13 of the Office Action, using *Foster*. Applicant disagrees for the reasons already
14 discussed. Nowhere does *Foster* teach or suggest "communicating, by a
15 component of an operating system, a non-standard USB device request to a device,
16 the non-standard USB device request requesting an extended property from the
17 device, the extended property providing data that is predetermined to be
18 compatible for use by the component or the operating system, the data comprising
19 user interface information associated with the USB device", as claim 16 recites.

20 Instead, *Foster* teaches that a user creates a user interface (UI) on a
21 computer coupled to a remote control device and subsequently downloads the UI
22 to the remote control device for display by selecting "a download command",
23 which causes the generated UI to be installed onto the remote control unit. For
24 instance, *Foster* teaches that responsive to placing a remote control unit into a
25 docking station connected to a general-purpose computer, the remote control unit

Appl. No. 09/745,385

Reply to Final OA of February 10, 2004

1 and computer establish a connection that a user can later use to communicate the
2 UI to the remote control unit. To this end, *Foster* at col. 6, lines 4-9, that "[t]he
3 docking station 130 is coupleable to the I/O interface 115 of the general purpose
4 computer 100, preferably in conformance with an interface standard which is
5 common [...] such as serial or USB." Thus, *Foster* teaches that the USB host
6 computer 100 communicates with the USB docking station device 130 via a
7 conventional USB interface.

8 Conventional USB interfaces specify standard USB commands and do not
9 specify "a non-standard USB device request", as claim 16 recites. Thus, a system
10 of *Foster* that teaches exchange of commands based on a conventional USB
11 specification may never utilize "a non-standard USB device request", which is not
12 specified in a conventional USB specification, and which claim 16 recites. For
13 this reason alone, the references of record do not teach or suggest the features of
14 claim 16.

15 Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 16 over *Bayramoglu* in
16 view of *Foster* is improper and should be withdrawn.

17 As an additional matter, at page 5, the Action addresses "a non-standard
18 USB device request", as claim 16 recites, by asserting that to the extent that these
19 features are "extra or extended to what is shown in *Bayramoglu* et al, the
20 Examiner takes Official Notice that a non-standard USB request would be used, in
21 order to provide flexibility to receive extended properties."

22 Thus, the Action, after admitting that *Bayramoglu* does not teach or suggest
23 "a non-standard USB device request", seemingly relies on personal knowledge to
24 incorporate these missing features into *Bayramoglu* and thereby modify the
25 reference to something that is not taught or suggested in an attempt at arriving at

Appl. No. 09/745,385

Reply to Final OA of February 10, 2004

1 the claimed "extended property descriptor" without pointing to any specific
2 teaching or suggestion. For the reasons already provided, the cited combination of
3 *Bayramoglu* and/or *Foster* does not teach or suggest any USB command
4 communication beyond that described in a conventional USB specification.
5 Additionally, the references of record are completely silent with respect to any
6 "extended properties" anything.

7 Since the Office is seemingly relying on personal knowledge:

8 *"[w]hen a rejection in an application is based on facts within the*
9 *personal knowledge of an employee of the office, the data shall be as*
10 *specific as possible, and the reference must be supported, when*
11 *called for by the applicant, by the affidavit of such employee, and*
12 *such affidavit shall be subject to contradiction or explanation by the*
13 *affidavits of the applicant and other persons."* 37 CFR
14 §1.104(d)(2).

15 If this rejection is maintained on a similar basis in a subsequent action, it is
16 respectfully requested for the Examiner to supply an affidavit to support this
17 modification to the cited combination to arrive at what the Action has already
18 admitted are features missing from the cited references, and features that are
19 recited in claim 16.

20 Dependent Claims 17-20 depend from claim 16 and are allowable over the
21 references of record by virtue of this dependency. For this reason alone, the 35
22 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 17-20 over *Bayramoglu* in view of *Foster* is
23 improper and should be withdrawn.

24 Moreover, as set forth above with respect to claims 2-5, claims 17-20
25 include additional features that are not taught or suggested by the cited
combination. For these additional reasons, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of
claims 17-20 should be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 09/745,385

Reply to Final OA of February 10, 2004

1 **Claim 21** recites “an extended property descriptor stored in the memory,
2 the extended property descriptor identifying a set of user interface information
3 corresponding to the USB device and in a data format predetermined to be
4 compatible for use by a requesting application executing on a remote computing
5 device”, and “a control program module stored in the memory, the control
6 program module being configured to send the extended configuration descriptor to
7 a requestor in response to receiving a host-specific device request at the port.”
8 For the reasons already discussed above, the cited combination does not teach or
9 suggest these claimed features.

10 Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 21 is improper and
11 should be withdrawn.

12 **Claims 22-24** depend from claim 21 and are allowable over the references
13 of record by virtue of this dependency. For this reason alone, the 35 USC §103(a)
14 rejection of claims 22-24 over *Bayramoglu* and/or *Foster* is improper and should
15 be withdrawn.

16 Moreover, as set forth above with respect to claims 2-5, claims 22-24
17 include additional features that are not taught or suggested by the cited
18 combination. For these additional reasons, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of
19 claims 22-24 should be withdrawn.

20 **Claim 25** recites “receiving a request from an application program for a
21 descriptor that specifies user interface information in a data format predetermined
22 to be compatible for use by the application program and corresponding to the USB
23 device”, “querying the USB device with a host-specific device request to obtain
24 the property descriptor”, “responsive to the querying, receiving the descriptor”,
25 and “providing the received property descriptor to the requesting application

Appl. No. 09/745,385

Reply to Final OA of February 10, 2004

1 program." For the reasons already discussed above, the cited combination does
2 not teach or suggest these claimed features.

3 Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 25 over *Bayramoglu*
4 and/or *Foster* is improper and should be withdrawn.

5 Claims 26-30 depend from claim 25 and are allowable over the references
6 of record by virtue of this dependency. For this reason alone, the 35 USC §103(a)
7 rejection of claims 26-30 over *Bayramoglu* and/or *Foster* is improper and should
8 be withdrawn.

9 Moreover, as set forth above with respect to claims 2-5, claims 26-30
10 include additional features that are not taught or suggested by the cited
11 combination. For these additional reasons, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of
12 claims 26-30 should be withdrawn.

13 Claim 31 recites "receiving a host-specific request for an extended property
14 descriptor from a requestor, the extended property descriptor indicating one or
15 more user interface elements that correspond to the USB device, the one or more
16 user interface elements being predetermined to be compatible for use by an
17 application executing or for execution on a remote computing device", and
18 "responsive to the receiving, communicating the extended property descriptor to
19 the requestor." For the reasons already discussed above, the cited combination
20 does not teach or suggest these claimed features.

21 Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 30 over *Bayramoglu*
22 and/or *Foster* is improper and should be withdrawn.

23 Claims 32-34 depend from claim 31 and are allowable over the references
24 of record by virtue of this dependency. For this reason alone, the 35 USC §103(a)
25

Appl. No. 09/745,385
Reply to Final OA of February 10, 2004

1 rejection of claims 32-34 over *Bayramoglu* and/or *Foster* is improper and should
2 be withdrawn.

3 Moreover, as set forth above with respect to claims 2-5, claims 32-34
4 include additional features that are not taught or suggested by the cited
5 combination. For these additional reasons, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of
6 claims 32-34 over *Bayramoglu* and/or *Foster* should be withdrawn.


7
8 New claims 38-46 depend from respective ones of independent base Claims
9 1, 6, or 12, and are patentable over *Bayramoglu* and/or *Foster* at least for the
10 reasons presented above.

11
12 **Conclusion**

13 Pending Claims 1-34 and 38-46 are in condition for allowance and action to
14 that end is respectfully requested. Should any issue remain that prevents
15 allowance of the application, the Office is encouraged to contact the undersigned
16 prior or issuance of a subsequent Office action.

17
18
19 Respectfully Submitted,

20
21 Dated: 7/12/04

22 By: 
23 Brian G. Hart
24 Reg. No. 44, 421
25 (303) 539-0265 x 241